United Nations A/C.2/72/SR.26

General Assembly
Seventy-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
19 January 2018

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 26th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 28 November 2017, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Jürgenson ..... (Estonia)

Contents

Statement by the Chair

Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(c) External debt sustainability and development (*continued*)

(e) Financial inclusion for sustainable development (*continued*)

(f) Promotion of international cooperation to combat illicit financial flows in order to foster sustainable development (*continued*)

Agenda item 18: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development (*continued*)

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(c) Disaster risk reduction (*continued*)

(e) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (*continued*)

(f) Convention on Biological Diversity (*continued*)

(g) Education for sustainable development (*continued*)

(h) Harmony with Nature (*continued*)

(i) Ensuring access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all (*continued*)

(j) Combating sand and dust storms (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

17-21179 (E)

Please recycle

Agenda item 21: Globalization and interdependence(*continued*)

(b) Science, technology and innovation for development (*continued*)

(d) Development cooperation with middle-income countries (*continued*)

Agenda item 22: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(a) Follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*)

Agenda item 23: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the Second United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2008–2017) (*continued*)

Agenda item 24: Operational activities for development

(a) Operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*continued*)

Agenda item 25: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition (*continued*)

Agenda item 26: Towards global partnerships (*continued*)

Agenda item 137: Programme planning

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Statement by the Chair

1. **The Chair** drew attention to informal conference room papers reflecting the agreement reached by delegations on cross-cutting language in the relevant draft resolutions. The conference room papers would allow the Committee to complete its work on time; in the absence of such a system, over 30 draft proposals would have been submitted on 24 November, creating a bottleneck for the translation and editing services of the Secretariat and leading to substantial delays in the Committee's work. All those conference room papers had been circulated through the Second Committee module on the e-deleGATE portal the day before and could also be accessed on the Second Committee website at https://www.un.org/en/ga/second/72/proposalstatus.shtml. Following the adoption of the draft proposals during the current meeting, the reports of the Committee under the various items would include the complete text.

Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(c) External debt sustainability and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.15 and A/C.2/72/L.46)

Draft resolutions on external debt sustainability and development (A/C.2/72/L.15 and A/C.2/72/L.46)

2. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.46, submitted by Mr. Menelaou (Cyprus), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.15. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.1, containing the language agreed to by delegations on pending text in draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.46. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

3. **Ms. Prizreni** (Albania), facilitator, said that the seventeenth preambular paragraph should read: "Taking note of the operational guidelines for sustainable financing promoted by the Group of 20, while urging the Group to continue to engage in an inclusive and transparent manner with other States Members of the United Nations in its work in order to ensure that initiatives of the Group complement or strengthen the United Nations system". Paragraph 9 should read: "Encourages the United Nations system, including the World Bank Group, the International Monetary Fund, and other relevant stakeholders, to continue to conduct analytical activities and to provide policy advice and technical assistance to Governments, upon request, in the areas of managing debt, and operating and maintaining databases, and in this regard recalls that the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development should continue its analytical and policy work and technical assistance on debt issues, including the Debt Management and Financial Analysis System Programme". Paragraph 24 should read: "Encourages Governments to be mindful of the ability of non-cooperative minority bondholders to block restructuring of a debt-crisis country's obligations, and encourages debtors and creditors to work together to draft bond agreements accordingly".

4. **The Chair** commended delegations for the cooperation and flexibility shown during negotiations on agreed language.

5. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.46, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.1 and as orally corrected, was adopted.*

6. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that although his country was joining consensus on the draft resolution, with regard to the reference in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, and the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, his delegation had expressed its concerns in a general statement on 17 November. Regarding references to non-cooperative minority bondholders, his delegation noted that the ability of such bondholders to block a deal was permitted in the bond issuance agreements agreed to by the issuing country and as such, it was outside the scope of a United Nations resolution to express concern about the enforceability of contracts.

7. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.15 was withdrawn.*

(e) Financial inclusion for sustainable development (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.10 and A/C.2/72/L.51)

Draft resolutions on financial inclusion for sustainable development (A/C.2/72/L.10 and A/C.2/72/L.51)

8. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.51, submitted by, Mr. Menelaou (Cyprus), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.10. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.2, containing the language agreed to by delegations on pending text in draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.51. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

9. **Ms. Alateibi** (United Arab Emirates), facilitator, said that paragraph 7 should read "Acknowledges the efforts and actions on financial inclusion for sustainable development undertaken by a wide range of stakeholders working in partnership, such as the Alliance for Financial Inclusion, the Better Than Cash Alliance and the Group of 20, the Global Partnership for Financial Inclusion; urges them to engage in an inclusive and transparent manner with the Member States in their work in order to ensure that their initiatives complement or strengthen the United Nations system, including the United Nations Capital Development Fund and the regional commissions; and encourages enhanced coordination and cooperation with the Inter-Agency Task Force on Financing for Development".

10. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.51, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.2 and as orally corrected, was adopted.*

11. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that although his country was joining consensus on the draft resolution, his delegation wished to clarify points in paragraph 10. The United States had consistently and publicly maintained that the issue of access to banking services, including correspondent banking, was more appropriately addressed by existing and ongoing dialogues in forums such as the Financial Action Task Force, the Financial Stability Board's Correspondent Banking Coordination Group, and the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. His country noted the emerging consensus that ineffective supervision of the money transfer sector in many jurisdictions, along with weak capacity to adequately manage risk, was an important driver of the challenges the sector faced in maintaining banking access. With regard to the draft resolution's reference to the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, his delegation had expressed its concerns in a general statement on 17 November.

12. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.10 was withdrawn.*

(f) Promotion of international cooperation to combat illicit financial flows in order to foster sustainable development (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.16 and A/C.2/72/L.53)

Draft resolutions on promotion of international cooperation to combat illicit financial flows in order to foster sustainable development (A/C.2/72/L.16 and A/C.2/72/L.53)

13. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.53, submitted by Mr. Menelaou (Cyprus), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.16. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.3, containing the language agreed to by delegations on pending text in draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.53. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

14. **Mr. Angelov** (Bulgaria), speaking in explanation of position on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, which aligned themselves with his statement, said that the European Union welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution before the Committee and reconfirmed its commitment to combating illicit financial flows. The European Union supported the call for strengthening good practices on asset returns, as they contributed to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals, especially target 16.4 of the Sustainable Development Goals, while fully respecting related existing instruments. Those instruments included the United Nations Convention against Corruption, which had a specialized mandate to foster asset return. However, since illicit financial flows covered a much broader variety of phenomena than asset return, the focus should neither be narrowed nor limited to the latter. The European Union therefore regretted the late introduction of asset return in many places in the draft resolution. The European Union remained committed to combating illicit financial flows in a broader sense.

15. **Mr. Bolaji** (Nigeria), speaking in explanation of position, said that since the introduction of the current draft resolution during the seventy-first session of the General Assembly, the delegations of Nigeria and Norway, inter alia, had attempted to bridge the knowledge gap within the United Nations regarding illicit financial flows. The global community should no longer turn a blind eye to the relationship between combating illicit financial flows, strengthening the recovery and return of stolen assets to countries of origin and the Sustainable Development Goals, which had been acknowledged by a variety of international bodies and instruments, including the report of the High-level Panel on Illicit Financial Flows from Africa, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, target 16.4 of the Sustainable Development Goals and the Abuja Declaration on promoting international cooperation to combat illicit financial flows and enhancing asset recovery to foster sustainable development.

16. Given the avalanche of information available, his delegation and many others had expected a more robust outcome from the informal consultations. Nevertheless, the draft resolution before the Committee had sufficient ingredients to boost international cooperation in preventing and combating those flows, caused by tax evasion, corruption, money laundering or transnational organized crime, and strengthen the recovery and return of illicitly acquired assets with a view to hastening the realization of the ambitious 2030 Agenda.

17. The destabilizing effects of illicit financial flows on the development of societies, especially developing countries, and the slow pace of the recovery and return of stolen assets, including proceeds of corruption, tax avoidance, transnational bribery and other forms of illicit flows to requesting States, would continue to a be a wound on the conscience of the global community.

18. In recognition of that fact and the need for all to work together, President Muhammadu Buhari had accepted the clarion call to champion the annual theme of the African Union for 2018, "Winning the fight against corruption: A sustainable path to Africa's transformation". The draft resolution before the Committee would serve as a veritable platform for collaboration at all levels towards achieving that onerous task.

19. Nigeria stood ready to contribute to the high-level meeting on international cooperation to combat illicit financial flows to be convened by the President of the seventy-third session of the General Assembly and enjoined Member States to exercise the necessary political will to address those matters by sharing information and providing technical assistance and capacity-building to developing countries. A focus on the positive impact of combating illicit financial flows and returning stolen assets for better and more fruitful livelihoods — rather than on the difficulties that could hinder progress to that end — would be helpful.

20. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.53, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.3, was adopted.*

21. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that combating money laundering, corruption and related crimes was essential to security and prosperity for all. However, his delegation had serious concerns about the language in the draft resolution, which undermined the ability to work constructively and collaboratively to address those challenges. Most significantly, in the draft resolution, the General Assembly failed to clearly acknowledge the central importance of the United Nations Convention against Corruption as the primary global legal framework for combating corruption and recovering stolen assets in the United Nations system. With 183 States parties, the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption served as the lead governing body in the field. It was lamentable that by adopting the draft resolution before the Committee, the General Assembly had undermined the ability of the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption to lead the global conversation based on common legal obligations and the input of national law enforcement experts. In fact, negotiations on the draft resolution had directly conflicted with the seventh session of the Conference of the States Parties, held from 6 to 10 November in Vienna. The resolution adopted by the seventh session of the Conference of the States Parties in Vienna had succeeded in areas where the draft resolution before the Committee did not. In particular, it had more accurately identified measures consistent with the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption that Governments must take to prevent and prosecute corruption and to return or dispose of stolen assets derived from corruption.

22. Although his delegation acknowledged that the term "illicit financial flows" had been used in prior resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, the United States generally opposed its inclusion because the term had no internationally agreed definition. In the absence of any common understanding of what constituted illicit financial flows, there should be clarity about specific underlying illegal activities that produced or contributed to that threat, such as embezzlement, bribery, money laundering, other corrupt practices or other crimes. His delegation also disagreed with the implication in the draft resolution that developing countries were more affected by illicit financial flows than developed countries, many of which had large financial sectors vulnerable to the negative effects of criminal activity.

23. In that context, all Member States must focus concretely on measures that they could implement to prevent, investigate and prosecute the underlying acts of corruption that generated the proceeds of crime and on measures that encouraged transparency and accountability in the use of recovered assets to ensure that they were best used to help those harmed by acts of corruption. The draft resolution did not achieve that objective and attached great importance to asset return or disposition, to the detriment of other critical steps in asset recovery that were equally important in the fight against corruption. While the eventual return or disposition of stolen assets to requesting States or to prior legitimate owners and victims of the crime, as

outlined in the United Nations Convention against Corruption, was a key goal of asset recovery, it was only part of the equation. Equal attention and resources must be devoted to establishing competent domestic legal and regulatory frameworks and institutions necessary to facilitate the proper detection and investigation of criminal proceeds and the freezing, seizure and confiscation thereof.

24. By focusing almost exclusively on the return of assets and not acknowledging the importance of other, equally integral components of the process, the draft resolution undermined the balanced approach reflected in the United Nations Convention against Corruption that was necessary for countries to successfully recover stolen assets. While his delegation acknowledged that some States had good practices to share regarding asset recovery, he was concerned about the singling out of specific practices promoted by certain States in the draft resolution. Asset recovery was not a tool of sustainable development, despite the links that might exist in some cases; the draft resolution, however, implied that the two must necessarily be connected. Asset recovery had traditionally served a number of purposes, of which law enforcement and the combating of impunity were the most prominent. With regard to the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, and the Paris Agreement, his delegation had addressed its concerns in a general statement delivered on 17 November.

25. Lastly, the United States was disappointed that the draft resolution added yet another controversial annual agenda item to an already overly crowded Second Committee agenda. His delegation strongly cautioned against holding substantive debates in the years ahead on highly technical topics that were best addressed by other, more appropriate organizations with the attendant technical expertise. To that end, his delegation urged closer collaboration with United Nations entities based in Vienna and bodies with the requisite expertise to confront those issues, such as the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, the United Nations Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, and the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention Against Corruption and its Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on Asset Recovery. He encouraged broader engagement with institutions such as the Financial Action Task Force and the nine Financial Action Task Force-style regional bodies, the Free-Standing Regional Bodies, and the Egmont Group. It seemed unnecessary and wasteful to occupy the time of Member States in the General Assembly with poorly constructed discussions on a highly technical subject that was already regularly addressed in such a wide range of other, more appropriate forums.

26. **Ms. Holt** (Canada) said that her country wished to emphasize its commitment to the draft resolution. Her delegation had chosen to join consensus but remained concerned about the persistent linkage in the draft resolution between the need to combat illicit flows and the call to strengthen the return of stolen assets. The United Nations Convention against Corruption provided the agreed, multilateral legal framework for the return of proceeds of corruption for the offences set out in the Convention. The concept of illicit flows was generally understood to be broader than proceeds of corruption. Her delegation was concerned that the persistent efforts to link the concepts of illicit financial flows and asset return created confusion and potential misunderstandings. Canada was also concerned about the lack of clarity in paragraph 4. Her country believed in a free, open and secure cyberspace. Member States should consider taking measures similar to those being taken against the illicit use of legal tender or other currencies. There should not be a difference between online and offline rights and countermeasures.

27. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.16 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 18: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development (*continued*)
(A/C.2/72/L.18 and A/C.2/72/L.50)

Draft resolutions on follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.18 and A/C.2/72/L.50)

28. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.50, submitted by Mr. Menelaou (Cyprus), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.18. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.4, containing the language agreed to by delegations on pending text in draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.50. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

29. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.50, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.4, was adopted.*

30. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that although his delegation was joining consensus on the draft resolution, he wished to clarify some important points. With regard to the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa

Action Agenda, his delegation had expressed its concerns in the general statement delivered on 17 November. The United States dissociated itself from paragraph 9, to the extent that such language could promote technology transfer that was not voluntary and on mutually agreed terms. For his country, any such language would have no standing in future negotiations. The United States continued to oppose language that it believed undermined intellectual property rights. Regarding the Inter-agency Task Force, the United States wished to reiterate its strong disagreement with the trade-related elements of the first substantive report by that body. To address those concerns, his delegation urged the Inter-agency Task Force to consult early and often with Member States in preparing the 2018 report. Finally, the United States expressed its deep disappointment that the draft resolution called for a report. In its opening statement, his country had identified the need for serious reform on the Committee and had called on delegations to limit overlap, have fewer reports, and have more effective outcomes. Given that the Inter-agency Task Force on Financing for Development generated an annual report on those issues, there was absolutely no value added by a further report and his country urged delegations to consider how better to use the limited resources of the Committee to make a meaningful impact.

31. **Mr. Kato** (Japan) said that despite the need for improvements, his delegation wished to underscore the success of the follow-up and review process of the forum on financing for development follow-up. Consensus had been achieved on the substantive outcome of the forum on financing for development follow-up based on the 2017 report of the Inter-agency Task Force on Financing for Development. There was therefore no need to duplicate or add non-productive features to the process within the Second Committee. It had been stated repeatedly that guidance from Member States for the thematic chapter of the report of the Inter-agency Task Force on Financing for Development was lacking. That feedback had been accommodated within the already existing follow-up and review process of the forum on financing for development follow-up. He wished to emphasize that the draft resolution before the Committee did not fully address concerns in that regard.

32. Nevertheless, the convening of a joint meeting of the Committee and the Economic and Social Council during the early months of the seventy-third session of the General Assembly and the summarization of the discussion and statements of Member States as a report of the Secretary-General would function as an opportunity to launch the preparation of the 2019 and 2020 Inter-agency Task Force on Financing for Development report, which would enrich the forum on financing for development follow-up process. The report of the Secretary-General, a summary of the meeting, would be taken up for consideration by the Inter-agency Task Force on Financing for Development and by Member States during the negotiations on the outcome of the forum on financing for development follow-up. The role of the Committee would be complementary to the forum on financing for development follow-up process.

33. It was regrettable that some paragraphs of the draft resolution contained substantive elements. His delegation believed that the outcome of the forum on financing for development follow-up should contain all substantive elements and was not in favour of including any of them in the draft resolution. Japan would contribute to the follow-up and review process of the forum on financing for development follow-up in a constructive manner.

34. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.18 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.30/Rev.1 and A/C.2/72/L.33/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on sustainable tourism and sustainable development in Central America (A/C.2/72/L.30/Rev.1)

35. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.30/Rev.1, submitted by the Dominican Republic on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.5, which contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

36. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Maldives, Paraguay and Turkmenistan wished to join the sponsors. He then noted that Argentina also wished to join the sponsors.

37. **Ms. Luna** (Dominican Republic), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.30/Rev.1 on behalf of the Central American Integration System (SICA), said that tourism played a key role in the development of the States members of SICA. Tourism was one of the largest diversifying sectors, had registered sustained growth and created jobs, and was contributing to the eradication of poverty. Sustainable tourism promoted entrepreneurship and contributed to the empowerment of marginalized groups, particularly women and young people. It was important to underscore that positive outcome in 2017, the International Year of Sustainable

Tourism for Development. According to a 2016 report of the Secretary-General (A/72/174), Central America had received almost 11 million international visitors in 2016, which had generated $11.4 billion in revenue, up from 4.3 million visitors and revenue of $3 billion in 2000.

38. The draft resolution reflected the growing challenges facing the region due to climate change, which required immediate preventative measures to mitigate its impact of floods, hurricanes and earthquakes that caused damage to the natural resources and cultural heritage that were important for tourism.

39. She wished to make an oral correction to the text of the draft resolution. In paragraph 7, the word "flora" should be removed. The paragraph would read "[...] conserve and protect the environment, respect wildlife, biodiversity, ecosystems and cultural diversity [...]".

40. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.30/Rev.1, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.5 and as orally corrected, was adopted.*

Draft resolution on agricultural technology for sustainable development (A/C.2/72/L.33/Rev.1)

41. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.33/Rev.1 submitted by Israel on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.6, which contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

42. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Kingdom had joined as sponsors of the revised draft resolution. He then noted that Antigua and Barbuda, Burundi, Cameroon, Eritrea, Guinea-Bissau, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Uganda also wished to join as the sponsors of the revised draft resolution.

43. **Ms. Keren** (Israel), introducing the draft resolution, said that it addressed a number of key issues, including the need for innovative solutions throughout the food system, the importance of building healthy agricultural systems and the essential role of demand-driven rural advisory services that focused on local contexts. The draft resolution also highlighted the contribution of agricultural technology to urban farming and the importance of adapting agricultural technology to the needs of women, young people and older farmers, as well as making information and communications technology accessible to them. The wide support for the draft resolution was a testament to the role of agricultural technology in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

44. **Ms. Shurbaji** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that efforts to enhance and improve agricultural technology should be stepped up and that technology should be transferred to developing countries. Her Government subscribed to all international and national efforts aimed at building capacity and encouraging the use of local expertise. However, that did not change the fact that the main sponsor of the draft resolution was not legally or ethically entitled to submit such a resolution on sustainable development because it was an occupying Power that hindered agricultural development and even economic development in occupied Arab territories in Palestine and the Syrian Golan.

45. The main sponsor was also an occupying force that had forcibly displaced millions of Palestinians and hundreds of thousands of Syrians. It had confiscated their lands and built illegal settlements on those lands. It had prevented people in the Syrian Golan from benefiting from agriculture by confiscating around 28 per cent of the agricultural land belonging to Syrians and by limiting access to natural resources, especially water, to Israeli settlers. Israel also continued to undermine all projects by farmers and continued to confiscate their produce.

46. Adoption of the draft resolution submitted by Israel would mean ignoring the annual reports issued by the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), which documented the suffering of people under occupation as a result of discriminatory and unjust policies that directly affected the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals and ran counter to the goal of leaving no one behind. If it adopted the draft resolution, the Committee would also be ignoring the fact that Israel exploited the United Nations to promote a fake commitment to sustainable development, while adopting measures and policies that hindered the creation of an economic environment conducive to Palestinian and Syrian efforts to achieve sustainable economic development. The United Nations had issued a number of documents, reports and resolutions that proved that Israel, the occupying Power, did not uphold the recommendations of the United Nations and continued its unjust occupation. Those violations extended to the agricultural sector, which was vital to all people in the region and their economy.

47. One example of the impact of the occupation on agriculture was the comparison between the agricultural productivity of Palestine and that of the same ecological regions in Israel and Jordan. The productivity of a unit of land in Palestine was half that of the same unit in Jordan and 43 per cent lower than in Israel. The UNCTAD report stated that the gap in productivity was mainly due to the occupation and its policies.

48. All were well aware that a draft resolution on addressing the challenges of sustainable development could not be submitted by a State that occupied land, violated international resolutions, uprooted olive trees in Palestine and the occupied Syrian Golan, seized land, restricted access to water resources, limited marketing opportunities, and followed discriminatory policies that undermined investment opportunities. Her delegation was therefore calling for a vote on the draft resolution, and would be voting against it.

49. *At the request of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.33/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia.

Against:

Syrian Arab Republic.

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Chad, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sudan, Tajikistan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen.

50. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.33/Rev.1, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.6, was adopted by 141 votes to 1, with 34 abstentions.*

51. **Mr. Lemine** (Mauritania), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, said that Israel, the occupying Power, did not have the right to address sustainable agricultural development, given the crimes it had committed against the agricultural sector in the Occupied Palestinian Territory and the occupied Golan. In paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, Israel admitted that the agricultural sector was vitally important for food security and nutrition and a driver of economic, social and environmental changes in food systems worldwide. At the same time, Israel had committed a number of flagrant violations that contradicted the content of the draft resolution, as attested to by the UNCTAD report on the agricultural sector in Palestine, according to which restrictions on the movement of farmers, services and agricultural trade entailed additional time and financial costs, due to the extra time spent at checkpoints, roadblocks and other barriers. Those resulted in inflated transportation costs, greater risks and possible damage, especially to perishable products. There was also the possibility of agricultural services delays or even a lack of provision of services, especially with regard to animal health and plant protection. The report also stated that Palestinian agricultural structures and assets had been subjected to recurrent demolition by the occupying Power. Affected productive assets included animal sheds owned by Bedouin, water wells, and village roads.

52. The report by the Committee investigating Israeli practices that violated the human rights of Palestinians stated that Israeli settlements were being built in the

West Bank. Numerous restrictions affected Palestinian farmers' access to agricultural fields. Israel had created a closed military zone along the border with Jordan, covering approximately 41,000 acres of land that had previously been farmed by Palestinians and was off limits to them.

53. Israel called on Member States to make sustainable agricultural development part of their national strategies, yet successive Israeli Governments had sought to destroy Palestinian agriculture. For example, Israel continued to prevent Palestinians from accessing 60 per cent of the land in Area C in the West Bank. Israeli settlers and the Israeli army were the two parties that had access to those lands.

54. Referring to paragraph 14 of the draft resolution, he said that Amnesty International had reported that, over four decades, Israel had issued fake orders to preserve natural assets, including water, which had undermined Palestinian agriculture in the West Bank. At the same time, Israeli settlers had full access to water and irrigation in illegal settlements.

55. In light of the above, the Arab Group had abstained from voting and called upon all Member States to reconsider their positions on the draft resolution.

56. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and recognized the important role of agricultural technology in enhancing productivity. However, some clarifications were needed. His delegation's concerns about the references in the resolution to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement and climate change had been addressed in a previous statement. The United States dissociated itself from any reference to the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030, since such language could promote transfers of technology that were not voluntary and on mutually agreed terms. For the United States, any such language would have no standing in future negotiations and the United States opposed any language that undermined intellectual property rights.

57. Furthermore, the draft resolution did not acknowledge the importance of science and risk-based policy frameworks in transfers of technology. Efficient, transparent and predictable safety assessments were key to ensuring that innovative technologies were safe and reached farmers in the field without undue delay. In many cases, solutions had escaped farmers because non-existent or unscientific policies discriminated against innovative solutions, delayed product approval and discouraged investment by the private sector. His Government supported gender-inclusive macroeconomic labour and social policies that promoted inclusive growth, women's full and productive employment, and decent work that protected women's right to work and rights at work, including in the agricultural sector. As the sixteenth preambular paragraph was unclear when it came to introducing gender-responsive interventions at all stages of agricultural innovation processes, his delegation dissociated itself from that language and would not view it as a basis for future negotiations. In addition, his Government supported the enhancement of women's access to and participation in local, regional and international markets. However, as a practical matter, no Government with a market-based economy could ensure access or participation in markets. Consequently, his delegation dissociated itself from the language that referred to ensuring participation in markets, and did not view that language as a basis for future negotiations. The United States would welcome future opportunities to discuss such issues in a clearer and more appropriate manner.

58. **Mr. Danon** (Israel), making a general statement, said that the 2030 Agenda recognized the central role of agriculture in lifting people out of poverty and hunger. Agriculture not only contributed to food security and nutrition, but was also the largest employer and source of income in the world. Despite the central role of agriculture in feeding the planet, smallholder farmers in developing countries accounted for 75 per cent of the world's poor, with women farmers being the most vulnerable and neglected. Farmers had difficulty breaking free of the cycle of poverty and hunger because they had little access to information and communications technology and lacked the machinery needed to enhance productivity. The draft resolution just adopted was geared towards breaking that cycle through the use of agricultural technology for the benefit of all, leaving no one behind.

59. Israel had experienced the transformative power of agricultural technology and innovation and continued to explore new ways to achieve sustainable development through technology. His delegation had recently co-hosted a side event on satellite technology for sustainable development with its French partners. The Venus vegetation-monitoring satellite was the fruit of scientific collaboration between the Israeli and French space agencies and was just one example of how cutting-edge technology could keep policymakers informed about agricultural development trends.

60. Unfortunately, the draft resolution had not been adopted by consensus. Ironically, the delegations that had prevented a consensus were the same ones that accused his delegation of politicizing the Committee.

Even more ironically, their countries were the ones that would benefit the most from the resolution. Once again, the leaders of those countries had put petty politics before the needs of their own people. That was truly a shame.

61. Agriculture should bring all countries together. By calling for a vote, those Member States had shown that instead of planting the seeds of peace, they preferred to sow seeds of hate. Their actions were a distraction from the important work of the Committee.

62. Adopting the draft resolution was a good start but much remained to be done. Agricultural technology had great potential in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. By bringing together their resources and knowledge, Member States could ensure that no child went hungry and no farmer was trapped in the cycle of poverty, and all countries could become masters of their own destinies.

63. **Mr. Shawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that the principle of leaving no one behind was essential as the second year of the 2030 Agenda approached. That principle must be echoed in every measure taken. For reasons that had nothing to do with Governments or people, the failure to meet the challenge of leaving no one behind could be involuntary and the result of reasons that were beyond the control of Member States. If that was a deliberate planned policy, then it was a crime and those responsible should be held to account. Israel, the occupying Power, had shown that it did not want the Palestinian people to achieve that goal through planned policies adopted in all aspects of the lives of the Palestinian people.

64. With regard to the draft resolution on agricultural technology introduced by the occupying State, it was important to bear in mind facts that had been set forth in United Nations reports, which demonstrated that Israel, the occupying Power, wanted the Palestinians to be left behind. As evidence, reference should be made to the report of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD/GDS/APP/2015/1) which indicated that Israeli constraints on the movement of Palestinians led to costs. Estimates showed that the costs of exporting and importing were twice as much for Palestinian agents as for Israeli agents, while the procedures for importing required four times the amount of time Israeli importers spent on similar activities.

65. Furthermore, the Government of Israel controlled water allocation and exercised veto power over Palestinian drilling, rehabilitation and investment in water infrastructure. Both the Palestinian National Authority and Palestinian farmers were denied the right to construct wells to meet the growing demand for water, even when that water originated almost entirely in the West Bank.

66. The ongoing occupation of Area C deprived the Palestinian economy of 63 per cent of the agricultural resources of the West Bank, including the most fertile and best grazing land, while the construction of the separation barrier and the expansion of Israeli settlements had diminished the area available for agricultural activities.

67. During the olive harvest, because of threats by settlers, most output was lost or destroyed and investment in the agricultural sector, marketing or production was impossible. Additional costs resulted from the destruction of infrastructure used in the sector. Olive groves around settlements in the West Bank were subject to fire, uprooting and vandalism by settlers. It was estimated that, since 1967, more than 800,000 productive olive trees had been uprooted. That destruction continued, as documented by the Office of the United Nations Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process.

68. The agricultural sector had greatly suffered from the occupation, and its contribution to the economy had declined in spite of the dynamic nature of the sector, which might enable it to make a greater contribution if agricultural lands increased and the constraints imposed by the Israeli occupation ended. Numerous documents showed that since the Israeli occupation of Palestinian land and the Syrian Golan in 1967, Israel had methodically and relentlessly worked to destroy the Palestinian agricultural sector. It was therefore inconceivable that an occupying Power might introduce a draft resolution on agricultural development when, in practice, it did exactly the opposite.

(c) Disaster risk reduction (*continued*)
(A/C.2/72/L.14 and A/C.2/72/L.47)

Draft resolutions on disaster risk reduction
(A/C.2/72/L.14 and A/C.2/72/L.47)

69. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.47, submitted by Ms. Louis (Saint Lucia), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.14. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.7, which contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications. He commended delegations for the cooperation and flexibility shown during the negotiations.

70. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.47, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.7, was adopted.*

71. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that his country strongly supported disaster risk reduction, including through development assistance efforts and technical cooperation with other nations to improve preparation for and response to disasters. While it had joined consensus on the draft resolution, some clarifications were needed. His delegation's concerns about the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the Paris Agreement, climate change and other issues had been addressed in a statement delivered on 17 November.

72. With respect to the sixteenth preambular paragraph, although regional and national efforts to reduce the risk of disasters were important, the draft resolution should not single out one regional initiative to the exclusion of others. He expressed disappointment that the draft resolution did not include language that recognized the increased prevalence and risk of gender-based violence in humanitarian crises. He reiterated the explanation of position of the United States on the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, as delivered on 18 March 2015.

73. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.14 was withdrawn.*

(e) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.37 and A/C.2/72/L.54)

Draft resolutions on the implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (A/C.2/72/L.37 and A/C.2/72/L.54)

74. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.54, submitted by Ms. Louis (Saint Lucia), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.37. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.8, which contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

75. **Ms. Louis** (Saint Lucia), Vice Chair, said that, in the absence of the facilitator, she wished to make some oral corrections to seven paragraphs in draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.54 in order to bring the draft into line with the original text agreed during the no-objection procedure.

76. The twelfth preambular paragraph should be replaced by the original paragraph, which read "recognizing that drought resilience is an important element in the implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa, as well as of target 15.3 on land degradation neutrality". She also drew attention to a number of minor drafting changes.

77. **The Chair** commended delegations for the cooperation and flexibility shown during the negotiations.

78. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.54, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.8 and as orally corrected, was adopted.*

79. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that his country supported the work done by the parties to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification. However, his delegation was concerned that the draft resolution did not accurately reflect decisions made by those parties since it repeatedly conflated language from the 2030 Agenda with text carefully negotiated and agreed upon at the thirteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, and, in many instances, used language that was inconsistent with the outcome of that Conference.

80. The failure by the General Assembly to respect the decisions of an independent Conference of the Parties did no service to the implementation of the Convention and would make it more difficult to take collaborative action to combat desertification. Any future resolutions concerning the Convention should reflect the will of the parties by recognizing and accurately reflecting agreed language. The Convention imposed legally binding obligations on the parties to the Convention, but the draft resolution just adopted did not and could not do so. Furthermore, the Conference of the Parties, not the General Assembly, provided guidance, through its decisions, to the parties on the implementation of the Convention. As a result, when there was a discrepancy between the General Assembly text and the decisions of the Conference of the Parties, his delegation would look only at the latter.

81. Concerning language in the preambular portion on the strategic plan for forests 2017–2030, his delegation supported the aims of the plan but dissociated itself from unacceptable language on transfers of technology in the plan and would not consider it as the basis for future

discussions. The United States therefore dissociated itself from the relevant text to the extent that it referred to transfers of technology and the distribution of intellectual property rights that were not voluntary and on mutually agreed terms. For the United States, any such language would have no standing in future negotiations. The United States would continue to oppose language that undermined intellectual property rights.

82. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.37 was withdrawn.*

(f) Convention on Biological Diversity (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.34 and A/C.2/72/L.56)

Draft resolutions on implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its contribution to sustainable development (A/C.2/72/L.34 and A/C.2/72/L.56)

83. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.56, submitted by Ms. Louis (Saint Lucia), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.34. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.9, which contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

84. **Ms. Fassio-Canuto** (Italy), Vice-Chair and facilitator, introduced a number of oral corrections to the draft resolution in order to reinstate text that had been agreed upon by delegations under the no-objection procedure. The first correction pertained to decision CBD/CP/MOP/VIII/19 with footnote number 11 and decision CBD/NP/MOP/DEC/2/7 with footnote 12. Footnote 11 should read "adopted at the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the parties to the Cartagena Protocol at its eighth meeting"; and footnote 12 should read "adopted at the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the parties to the Nagoya Protocol at its second meeting".

85. The second correction should be made in the seventeenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution before the Committee. After the word "Secretariat" in the first line in the original language approved under the no-objection procedure, there had been a footnote, which was footnote 17 in the current version and should be reinstated. The new footnote 17 had originally said "CITES resolution 16.3 strategic vision: 2008 to 2020". Delegations were aware that that wording might not be the appropriate editorial wording and had advised her that they would be flexible regarding the exact wording of the footnote and the use of the acronym CITES. The Secretariat should consult the facilitator when preparing the final correct text of the footnote.

86. The third correction involved the current paragraph 3. In the first line, "*Recalls*" should be replaced by "*Notes*".

87. All the corrections reflected the desire of Member States to maintain language that they had agreed upon during negotiations.

88. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.56, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.9 and as orally corrected, was adopted.*

89. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.34 was withdrawn.*

(g) Education for sustainable development (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.24 and A/C.2/72/L.45)

Draft resolutions on education for sustainable development in the framework of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (A/C.2/72/L.24 and A/C.2/72/L.45)

90. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.45, submitted by Ms. Louis (Saint Lucia), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.24. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.10, which contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

91. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.45, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.10, was adopted.*

92. **Ms. Christian** (United States of America) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution on education for sustainable development but wished to clarify points regarding quality education and education investments. The United States was firmly committed to providing equal access to quality education. As Member States had a wide array of policies and actions that could be appropriate in that regard, the non-binding draft resolution before the Committee should not attempt to define the elements of or requirements for a quality education. When the draft resolution called on Member States to strengthen various aspects of education, that should be done in terms that were appropriate and consistent with the respective federal, state and local authorities. With regard to the reference in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, her delegation had expressed its concerns in a general statement delivered on 17 November 2017.

93. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.24 was withdrawn.*

(h) Harmony with Nature (A/C.2/72/L.38 and A/C.2/72/L.52)

Draft resolutions on harmony with Nature (A/C.2/72/L.38 and A/C.2/72/L.52)

94. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.52, submitted by Ms. Louis (Saint Lucia), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.38. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.11, which contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

95. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.52, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.11, was adopted.*

96. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.38 was withdrawn.*

(i) Ensuring access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.3 and A/C.2/72/L.55)

Draft resolutions on ensuring access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all (A/C.2/72/L.3 and A/C.2/72/L.55)

97. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.55, submitted by Ms. Louis (Saint Lucia), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.3. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.12, which contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested.

98. **Ms. Jurečko** (Slovenia), facilitator, said that she wished to introduce oral corrections to align the text of the draft resolution with language agreed during informal consultations. In the eighth preambular paragraph, "more than" should be replaced by "over" to read "*Deeply concerned* that over 3 billion people in developing countries...". In the same paragraph, in the penultimate line, rather than "those figures", the text should read "both access figures". In the second line of the fifteenth preambular paragraph, rather than "including the Sustainable Energy for All initiative", the text should read "including Sustainable Energy for All". In the same paragraph, "the Small Island Developing States Sustainable Energy Initiative" should read "SIDS Dock". In paragraph 6, "including" should be replaced by "such as". In paragraph 18, where the text read "the Sustainable Energy for All initiative", the words "the" and "initiative" should be deleted. Minor drafting changes were also made to paragraphs 3 and 10.

99. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the United States recognized the importance of access to affordable, reliable and modern energy. However, it regretted the need to call a vote and to have to vote against the draft resolution due to unacceptable language on technology transfer in the thirteenth preambular paragraph and in paragraph 17. In that context, the United States reaffirmed that the strong protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights provided the incentives needed to foster innovation that enabled current and future health, environmental and development challenges to be addressed. Therefore, the United States did not support the references to technology transfer in those paragraphs and continued to oppose language that undermined intellectual property rights. The United States could not support language that promoted technology transfer that was not on mutually agreed terms and voluntary. United Nations resolutions were not the appropriate vehicle for such pronouncements, and the inclusion of such language was an attempt to prejudice negotiations under way or anticipated in other, more appropriate forums. The United States had therefore ca'led a vote on the draft resolution, would vote against it, and urged all Member States to do so as well. It also urged them to refrain from continuing to use resolutions that should be matters of consensus as vehicles for pursuing other agendas. That practice made it difficult for the United States to continue to join consensus on those draft resolutions and would result in further weakening of the agenda of the Committee.

100. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece,

Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

101. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.55, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.12 and as orally corrected, was adopted by 175 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

102. **Ms. Engelbrecht Schadtler** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution before the Committee to express its traditional support for the Group of 77 and China. However, in keeping with its position regarding the 2030 Agenda, Venezuela could not support the references in the draft resolution on the proposal of the Secretary-General entitled "Sustainable Energy for All". That initiative had been created without the mandate of States and was not conducted through a proper process of consultation and approval by Member States. Similarly, it ignored the negotiation process conducted by Governments on those topics and proposed strategies that were at odds with sovereignty and could lead to market distortions that created barriers to the sale of oil and petroleum products.

103. She expressed her delegation's reservations regarding the references to a modern energy system, which implied the use of new technologies without the required evaluation of their application and of technology development priorities in a national context. In addition, as stated when the 2030 Agenda was adopted, and consistent with both the outcome document of the third International Conference on Financing for Development and the Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, any reference to the elimination of subsidies for fossil fuels interfered with the public policies of the State. Venezuela also rejected the reference to low-carbon economies. She reiterated that Venezuela would not accept any type of evaluation, monitoring, reporting or review of its national energy policies, or any measures that implied any infringement of national sovereignty. Furthermore, that paragraph departed from and made substantive changes to the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development.

104. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.3 was withdrawn.*

(j) Combating sand and dust storms (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.4 and A/C.2/72/L.49)

Draft resolutions on combating sand and dust storms (A/C.2/72/L.4 and A/C.2/72/L.49)

105. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.49, submitted by Ms. Louis (Saint Lucia) Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.4. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.13, which contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

106. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.49, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.13, was adopted.*

107. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that the United States recognized that sand and dust storms were a significant concern for affected countries. Although his country had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, he wished to express concern with some of its paragraphs. With regard to the draft resolution's reference to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the Paris Agreement, his delegation had addressed its concerns in a general statement on 17 November. Regarding paragraph 4, his delegation did not support the United Nations Environment

Programme initiating an inter-agency process to prepare a global response to sand and dust storms, and would oppose any attempt to mandate the United Nations Environment Programme to develop a United Nations system-wide approach, as that was not within its programme of work and budget. The United States did not support paragraph 5 to the extent that such language could promote technology transfer that was not voluntary and on mutually agreed terms. Any such language would have no standing in future negotiations. The United States continued to oppose language that it believed undermined intellectual property rights.

108. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.4 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 21: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(b) Science, technology and innovation for development (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.6 and A/C.2/72/L.57)

Draft resolutions on science, technology and innovation for development (A/C.2/72/L.6 and A/C.2/72/L.57)

109. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.57, submitted by Ms. Louis (Saint Lucia), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.6. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.14, which contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

110. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.57, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.14, was adopted.*

111. **Ms. Christian** (United States of America) said that while her country had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, she wished to clarify important points. With regard to the reference to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda the Paris Agreement and climate change, her delegation had addressed its concerns in a general statement on 17 November. The United States dissociated itself from the eighteenth and twenty-fifth preambular paragraphs, and from paragraphs 12 and 27 to the extent that technology transfer references and encouraging financial assistance to the Technology Bank for the Least Developed Countries promoted technology transfer or distribution of intellectual property rights that was not voluntary and on mutually agreed terms. Any such language would have no standing in future negotiations. The United States continued to oppose language that it believed undermined intellectual property rights.

112. While the United States strongly supported efforts to advance disability-inclusive development, it must also dissociate itself from paragraph 8 for the same reasons. Technology transfer must be on mutually agreed terms and voluntary. The United States remained committed to promoting the rights and full inclusion of people with disabilities in society and partnered with Governments, civil society and the private sector to remove barriers to their economic empowerment.

113. The United States had consistently supported many important goals of Agenda 2063 of the African Union, most recently at the U.S.- African Union High Level Dialogue, held in Washington, D.C., on 16 November, at which improving access to and the quality of education, investing in infrastructure, protecting the environment, strengthening democracy and the rule of law and many other worthy initiatives shared by African countries and the United States had been discussed. Her delegation was, however, concerned by language committing to a reduction in food imports, which could have a negative impact on food security and might not be consistent with trade obligations of African members of the World Trade Organization. Her country hoped to hold further discussions with the African Union on that issue.

114. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.6 was withdrawn.*

(d) Development cooperation with middle-income countries (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.23 and A/C.2/72/L.60)

Draft resolutions on development cooperation with middle-income countries (A/C.2/72/L.23 and A/C.2/72/L.60)

115. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.60, submitted by Ms. Mele (Italy), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.23. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.15, which contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

116. **Ms. O'Hehir** (Australia), facilitator, said that she wished to request the removal of five editorial changes made by the editors in the Secretariat in order to reinstate the language agreed to by delegations during negotiations. In the seventh preambular paragraph, "achieving" should be replaced by "achieve". In the ninth preambular paragraph, "over the past decade" should be struck from the penultimate line. In the twelfth preambular paragraph, "the" should be struck before "least developed countries". In the eighteenth

preambular paragraph, "the common pursuit" should be replaced by "our common pursuit" and "including the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals" by "including achieving the Sustainable Development Goals". In paragraph 11, "the role of the" should be reinserted before "the private sector" in the first line.

117. **Mr. Mackei** (Belarus) said that the draft resolution was more focused on practical measures and more ambitious than the previous resolution 70/215. Recognizing and supporting middle-income countries would play an important systemic role in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda. The draft resolution underscored the need to take into account the specific challenges faced by those countries and called on the United Nations development system to support developing countries in their efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. He expressed gratitude to the delegations that had taken part in the consultations for having supported his delegation's proposal that a high-level meeting of the General Assembly should be convened at the beginning of its seventy-third session to discuss the gaps and challenges of middle-income countries in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

118. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.60, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.15 and as orally corrected, was adopted.*

119. **Ms. Christian** (United States of America) said that, with regard to the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the Paris Agreement, her delegation had addressed its concerns in a general statement on 17 November. While the United States continued to develop its policies on climate change, the language on climate change included in the draft resolution was without prejudice to her delegation's future positions. Regarding the eleventh preambular paragraph, Member States wishing to implement such policies must do so in a way that honoured relevant international rules and obligations.

120. In addition, the United States dissociated itself from the language in the fourteenth preambular paragraph, which suggested that the international economic environment did not already include coherent and mutually supporting trade, monetary and financial systems, or that global economic governance should be strengthened and enhanced. Furthermore, while that did not call for specific changes to market access, her delegation wished to note that WTO members would benefit individually and collectively from the full implementation of the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement. With respect to the sixteenth and seventeenth preambular paragraphs, the United States wished to underline the central message of financing for development, namely, that each country had primary responsibility for its own economic and social development and that the role of national policies and development strategies in identifying and addressing the particularities and development needs of middle-income countries, including addressing the challenges of inequality, could not be overemphasized.

121. The United States dissociated itself from the language in the eleventh preambular paragraph and in paragraphs 7 and 8, which risked promoting transfers of technology that were not voluntary or on mutually agreed terms. For the United States, any such language would have no standing in future negotiations. The United States continued to oppose language that undermined intellectual property rights. The United States dissociated itself from the sentence in paragraph 16 which noted with concern that access to concessional finance was reduced as countries' incomes increased. Countries' access to concessional finance should decrease as their incomes increased, and development cooperation providers should target their scarce concessional financing to the poorest and least creditworthy countries rather than trying to preserve access to concessional finance. The providers' implementation of their graduation policies should aim to smooth the transition away from concessional assistance and towards other sources of finance.

122. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.23 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 22: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(a) Follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.31 and A/C.2/72/L.61)

Draft resolutions on follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (A/C.2/72/L.31 and A/C.2/72/L.61)

123. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.61, submitted by Mr. Menelaou (Cyprus), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.31. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.16, which contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications. He commended delegations for their cooperation and flexibility during negotiations.

124. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.61, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.16, was adopted.*

125. **Mr. Brown** (United States of America) said that, with regard to the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the Paris Agreement, his delegation had raised its concerns in a general statement delivered on 17 November. While the United States continued to develop its policies on climate change, the language on climate change included in the draft resolution was without prejudice to his delegation's future positions.

126. The United States had historically been the largest bilateral provider of official development assistance (ODA). Though it had not committed to a specific quantitative ODA target, the United States had spent over $30 billion on ODA in 2016 and was committed to focusing ODA on contexts where it was needed the most and would have the greatest impact. Other countries should strive to achieve the same objective.

127. Regarding paragraph 21, the United States did not agree that the General Assembly should call on the parties to regional trade agreements to strengthen or otherwise modify those trade agreements because the General Assembly lacked the expertise and understanding to make such a call. As for paragraph 19, the United States noted that its language did not include a call for changes in market access. Although the term "illicit financial flows" had been used in previous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, the United States generally opposed its inclusion, since it did not have an internationally agreed definition. In the absence of any common understanding of what constituted illicit financial flows, there should be a specific reference to the underlying illegal activities that produced or contributed to that threat, such as embezzlement, bribery, money laundering or other corrupt practices or crimes.

128. The United States dissociated itself from paragraph 27 to the extent that encouraging international financial and technical assistance to the Technology Bank for the Least Developed Countries promoted transfers of technology or distributed intellectual property rights in a manner that was not mutually agreed and voluntary. For the United States, any such language would have no standing in future negotiations. The United States continued to oppose language that undermined intellectual property rights.

129. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.31 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 23: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the Second United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2008–2017) (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.22 and A/C.2/72/L.58)

Draft resolutions on implementation of the Second United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2008–2017)" (A/C.2/72/L.22 and A/C.2/72/L.58)

130. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.58, submitted by Ms. Mele (Italy), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.22. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.18, which contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

131. **Ms. Fitzmaurice Gray** (Ireland), co-facilitator, introduced two oral corrections. In paragraph 36, "the mobilization of additional resource" should be replaced by "additional resource mobilization". Toward the end of paragraph 54, the phrase should now read "in support of the poverty eradication-related internationally agreed development goals".

132. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.58, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.18 and as orally corrected, was adopted.*

133. **Ms. O'Hehir** (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Canada and New Zealand, said that the eradication of poverty in all its forms and dimensions was at the core of the work of the United Nations and at the heart of the 2030 Agenda, the aim being to ensure that no one was left behind. The work of the United Nations in that area was key to the realization of peace, prosperity and sustainable development. As such, the primary follow-up mechanisms for the eradication of poverty were guided by the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. The third United Nations decade for the eradication of poverty (2018–2027) should not create its own new process but instead be an opportunity for Member States to reflect and capture existing work that was fundamental to the United Nations system, improved outcomes and accelerated results to eradicate poverty. It was also important to recognize the work of the United Nations funds, programmes and specialized agencies that supported the implementation of the 2030 Agenda by Member States. Around $48 billion per year was being invested in that work, which involved introducing reforms to better align the system with the 2030 Agenda by implementing the mandates of the

quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development and ensuring that a complex and sophisticated approach to poverty eradication was at the heart of the United Nations system.

134. Moreover, the effective functioning of the United Nations and all its Committees was predicated on the strong, rigorous and analytical advice provided by the Secretariat. The delegations of Canada and New Zealand and her own delegation were therefore deeply concerned by the quality and accuracy of the budgeting process undertaken by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs and the subsequent advice offered by the budget office to Member States on the resource implications of the third United Nations decade for the eradication of poverty. Member States had been advised that there would be no programme budget implications associated with the draft resolution because the cost for a third decade had already been accounted for in the budget of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs. That was problematic from the perspective of the delegations of Canada and New Zealand and her own delegation because there had been no agreement or mandate at the beginning of the current session for the Secretariat to support a third decade for the eradication of poverty. The budgeting decisions of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs had pre-empted any consultation or decision by Member States to support a third decade. As a result, the budget information provided was misleading at best and clearly demonstrated the need to improve working methods in the area of advice on programme budget implications, and better align them with broader reforms of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs. That would include a review of Department reporting and analysis to ensure that it was in line with the range of mandates from Member States concerning its reform. The Secretariat should take note of her statement for further internal discussion, including with senior management. Australia, Canada and New Zealand had joined the consensus on the draft resolution but looked forward to better advice from the Secretariat in future.

135. **Mr. Brown** (United States of America) said that the United States had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and its concerns over the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the Paris Agreement had already been addressed in a statement made on November 17.

136. With regard to the tenth preambular paragraph, his delegation wished to reiterate its disagreement with elements of the first substantive report of the Inter-Agency Task Force on Financing for Development. To address those concerns, the Task Force should consult early and often with Member States as it prepared the 2018 report. Concerning preambular paragraph 19 bis, the United States supported the aims of the United Nations strategic plan for forests but dissociated itself from unacceptable language on transfers of technology and would not consider it as a basis for future discussions.

137. Regarding references to the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, much of the trade-related language had been overtaken by events since July 2015 and was immaterial. That language had no standing for ongoing work and negotiations involving trade. The United States dissociated itself with paragraph 29 to the extent that the references to transfers of technology promoted the distribution of intellectual property rights that was not voluntary and on mutually agreed terms. That language would have no standing in future negotiations. The United States continued to oppose language that undermined intellectual property rights.

138. Regarding the sixth preambular paragraph, the United States had consistently supported many goals of Agenda 2063 of the African Union, most recently at the high-level dialogue between the United States and the African Union in Washington, D.C., in 2016. In particular, the agenda had included goals such as improving access to and the quality of education, investment in infrastructure, protection of the environment, and the strengthening of democracy and the rule of law, all goals which were shared by both Africa and the United States. However, the language concerning the reduction of food imports was a cause for concern since it could have a negative impact on food security and be inconsistent with the trade obligations of African members of the World Trade Organization. Further discussions should be held on that issue.

139. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.22 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 24: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(a) Operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.41 and A/C.2/72/L.63)

Draft resolutions on operational activities for development of the United Nations system (A/C.2/72/L.41 and A/C.2/72/L.63)

140. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.63, submitted by Ms. Chanda (Zambia), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.41. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.19, which

contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications. He commended delegations for the cooperation and flexibility shown during the negotiations.

141. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.63, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.19, was adopted.*

142. **Ms. Christian** (United States of America) said that, with regard to the references to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement and climate change, her delegation had raised its concerns in a general statement delivered on 17 November.

143. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.41 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 25: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition (*continued*)
(A/C.2/72/L.12/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on the United Nations Decade of Family Farming (2019–2028) (A/C.2/72/L.12/Rev.1)

144. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.12/Rev.1, submitted by Costa Rica on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.20, which contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

145. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, China, Cuba, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, the Gambia, Haiti, India, Ireland, Jamaica, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Montenegro, Myanmar, Namibia, the Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, São Tomé and Príncipe, Serbia, the Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkmenistan had joined as sponsors of the draft resolution. He then noted that Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burundi, Ecuador, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Kenya, Liechtenstein, Mali, Mauritius, Mozambique, the Netherlands, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Uganda also wished to join as sponsors of the draft resolution.

146. **Mr. Mendoza García** (Costa Rica), introducing the draft resolution, said that, owing to the significant results achieved during the International Year of Family Farming in 2014, Angola, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Indonesia, Italy, Mexico, the Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Thailand and Uruguay had decided to join forces to extend the positive impact of that year and commit to adopting public policies and initiatives that strengthened family farming in those countries.

147. Family farming employed over 3.3 million persons and produced more than 80 per cent of food worldwide. It had a key role in food and nutrition security, rural employment, income generation and natural resource management. The development of family farming would lead to better opportunities for well-being and dignified living conditions. The main purpose of the Decade of Family Farming would be to contribute to the efforts of the international community to eradicate poverty in all its forms, reduce inequality and control climate change. The commitment to the 2030 Agenda should be led by concrete actions to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. Consequently, the Decade of Family Farming with its holistic and inclusive approach and a focus on the neediest, namely, rural farming families, would greatly contribute to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The draft resolution therefore reflected the perspectives of all the delegations present during the informal sessions and working to arrive at a comprehensive and inclusive document.

148. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.12/Rev.1, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.20, was adopted.*

149. **Ms. Christian** (United States of America) said that the United States had joined the consensus but was deeply concerned over the procedural issues during the negotiations, which had led to the insertion of problematic trade language in the sixteenth preambular paragraph. The United States had a long-standing objection to the inclusion of such language in United Nations resolutions. For that reason, her delegation was disassociating itself from that paragraph of the final text. The original text had been written in line with past resolutions seeking to establish commemorative days, years and decades. Such resolutions should be short, clear and procedural. It was therefore disappointing that Member States had chosen to introduce a contentious issue with no opportunity for discussion. It was regrettable that after the contentious language had been removed, her delegation had not been afforded the opportunity to negotiate a substitute. New language and concepts should have been introduced in the governing processes of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development. In addition to being concerned about the manner in which the language was introduced, her delegation was concerned about whether that subject matter was germane to the resolution. The

General Assembly should not opine on the appropriate characteristics of international systems that were independent of the United Nations system. As previously stated, the United States had substantive concerns about the language in question and would be willing to discuss it with Member States in appropriate forums at the World Trade Organization.

Draft resolutions on agriculture development, food security and nutrition (A/C.2/72/L.25 and A/C.2/72/L.59)

150. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.59, submitted by Ms. Mele (Italy), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.25. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.21, which contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

151. **Mr. Brown** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the United States remained committed to promoting agricultural development, food security and nutrition worldwide. Indeed, the United States was the single largest donor to programmes promoting global food security. However, the draft resolution went beyond addressing needs related to agricultural development, food security and nutrition and instead extended well beyond the appropriate role of the General Assembly. For example, the United States could not support language that sought to shape or otherwise prejudice discussions in independent organizations such as the World Trade Organization.

152. Specifically, the United States could not join a consensus on protectionism language on the eve of the Eleventh Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organization or the stale references to the Ministerial Declaration of the Tenth Ministerial Conference. WTO-consistent trade remedy measures and enforcement actions taken to protect economies from unfair and market-distorting practices of others were not protectionist. The United States did not advocate protectionism but saw no utility in reaffirming stale calls to avoid protectionism, a pledge that others routinely violated.

153. In addition, the United States was unable to join the consensus on the attempts by the General Assembly to prescribe the characteristics of the World Trade Organization. That was not a matter on which the General Assembly should opine. The United States likewise could not support language that called for greater cooperation and coordination between United Nations agencies and international trade organizations. The World Trade Organization was an independent body and its agenda would be set by its members. The United States recognized that Governments wished to pursue policies that contributed to the food security of their population, but to be successful, those policies must be consistent with international rules and obligations. The United States had consistently supported Agenda 2063 of the African Union, most recently at the U.S.-African Union High Level Dialogue, held in Washington, D.C.

154. In particular, the Agenda included goals such as improving access to and the quality of education, investment in infrastructure, protection of the environment, and the strengthening of democracy and the rule of law, all goals which were shared by both Africa and the United States. However, the language concerning the reduction of food imports was a cause for concern since it could have a negative impact on food security and be inconsistent with the trade obligations of African members of the World Trade Organization. Further discussions should be held on that issue.

155. Furthermore, the United States could not support language in the resolution that sought to promote transfers of technology that were neither voluntary nor on mutually agreed terms. For the United States, any such language would have no standing in future negotiations. The United States would continue to oppose language that undermined intellectual property rights. With regard to the references to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the Paris Agreement, his delegation had raised its concerns in a general statement delivered on 17 November. For the above-mentioned reasons, the United States called for a vote and would vote against the resolution.

156. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.59.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic,

Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

157. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.59, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.21, was adopted by 179 votes to 1, with no abstentions.*

158. **Mr. Angelov** (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia and Ukraine, said that the States members of the European Union attached the greatest importance to the development and strengthening of the open, universal, transparent and rules-based multilateral trading system centred on the World Trade Organization. Only such a system fostered coherence among trade policies across the globe and allowed regional and bilateral initiatives to be mutually supportive in advancing a progressive trade agenda and the economic development of its members, especially developing countries.

159. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.25 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 26: Towards global partnerships (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.42/Rev.1)

Draft decision entitled "Towards global partnerships" (A/C.2/72/L.42/Rev.1)

160. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft decision A/C.2/72/L.42/Rev.1, submitted by Estonia on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document. The draft decision contained no programme budget implications.

161. *Draft decision A/C.2/72/L.42/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Agenda item 137: Programme planning

162. **The Chair** said that the General Assembly had decided on 15 September to allocate agenda item 137, "Programme planning", to all the Main Committees and the plenary of the General Assembly in order to enhance discussions on the evaluation, planning, budgeting and monitoring of reports. No action was currently expected under that item.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.